arXiv:1508.01589v1 [math.NT] 7 Aug 2015

A CHARACTERIZATION OF POLYNOMIALS AMONG RATIONAL FUNCTIONS IN NON-ARCHIMEDEAN AND COMPLEX DYNAMICS

YÛSUKE OKUYAMA AND MAŁGORZATA STAWISKA

Abstract. From the viewpoint of dynamics and potential theory on the Berkovich projective line, we give a characterization of polynomials among rational functions, up to rational functions having potentially good reductions as exceptions, on the projective line over an algebraically closed field of any characteristic that is complete with respect to a non-trivial and possibly non-archimedean absolute value.

1. Introduction

Let K be an algebraically closed field of any characteristic that is complete with respect to a non-trivial and possibly non-archimedean absolute value $|\cdot|$. It is known that $K \cong \mathbb{C}$ if and only if K is archimedean. The Berkovich projective line $\mathsf{P}^1 = \mathsf{P}^1(K)$ is a compact augmentation of the (classical) projective line $\mathbb{P}^1 = \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, which contains $\mathbb{P}^1$ as its dense subset, and $\mathsf{P}^1 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ if and only if K is archimedean. Our aim is to contribute to the study of a characterization of polynomials among rational functions on $\mathbb{P}^1$ of degree > 1, up to *rational functions having potentially good reductions* as exceptions, from the point of view of dynamics and potential theory on the Berkovich projective line.

Let $f \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree $d > 1$.

Fatou-Julia terminology. The action of f on $\mathbb{P}^1$ uniquely extends to a continuous, open, and surjective endomorphism on P^1 with discrete fibers. Set $f^n := f \circ f^{n-1}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f^0 := \mathrm{Id}$. The *Berkovich Julia set* of f is the set of all points $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1$ such that for every open neighborhood U of $\mathcal{S}$ in P^1, $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} f^n(U) \supset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus E(f)$, where $E(f) := \left\{a \in \mathbb{P}^1 : \# \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} f^{-n}(a) < \infty\right\}$ is the (*classical*) *exceptional set* of f, and the *Berkovich Fatou set* of f is defined as $\mathsf{F}(f) := \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \mathsf{J}(f)$. By the definitions, $\mathsf{J}(f)$ and $\mathsf{F}(f)$ are respectively closed and open in P^1 and are f-totally invariant, that is, $f^{-1}(\mathsf{J}(f)) = \mathsf{J}(f) = f(\mathsf{J}(f))$ and $f^{-1}(\mathsf{F}(f)) = \mathsf{F}(f) = f(\mathsf{F}(f))$. Moreover, for every $a \in E(f)$, $f^{-N}(a) = \{a\}$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, so that $E(f) \subset \mathsf{F}(f)$ and $E(f)$ is at most countable. The fact $\mathsf{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$ is not trivial, in particular, for non-archimedean K (see Remark 3.7). A component of $\mathsf{F}(f)$ is called a *Berkovich Fatou component* of f. A Berkovich Fatou component of f is

---

Date: August 10, 2015.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37P50; Secondary 11S82, 31C15.

Key words and phrases. equilibrium measure, equilibrium mass distribution, potentially good reduction, potential theory, non-archimedean dynamics, complex dynamics.

mapped by f properly and onto a Berkovich Fatou component of f, and every component of the preimage of a Berkovich Fatou component of f under f is a Berkovich Fatou component of f.

Measures associated to f. The action of f on P^1 admits the *f-equilibrium* (*or canonical*) *measure* μ_f on P^1, which is characterized as the unique probability Radon measure ν on P^1 whose support is in $\mathsf{J}(f)$ and which satisfies the *f-balanced* property $f^*\nu = d \cdot \nu$ on P^1 (see Remark 3.8). Moreover, $\operatorname{supp} \mu_f = \mathsf{J}(f)$ (see §3.5).

If $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$, then f has the Berkovich Fatou component $D_\infty = D_\infty(f)$ containing ∞, and $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$ is a (non-empty) compact subset *of logarithmic capacity* > 0 with pole ∞. There exists the unique *equilibrium mass distribution* $\nu_\infty := \nu_{\infty, \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty}$ on $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$ with pole ∞ (see §2.5 for the details on logarithmic potential theory).

A terminology related to a reduction of f. It is convenient to adopt the following terminology; f has a *potentially good reduction* if there is a (non-classical) point $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \mathbb{P}^1 =: \mathsf{H}^1$ such that $\# \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f^{-n}(\mathcal{S}_0) < \infty$; then, indeed $\mathsf{J}(f) = \{\mathcal{S}_0\}$ (see Remark 3.9. This property is indeed equivalent to *f having a simple reduction* in [3, Definition 10.3]). Otherwise, f has *no potentially good reductions.* For archimedean K, f never has a potentially good reduction.

Main result. Our principal result is the following characterization of polynomials among rational functions, up to rational functions having potentially good reductions as exceptions.

Theorem 1. *Let K be an algebraically closed field of any characteristic that is complete with respect to a non-trivial and possibly non-archimedean absolute value $|\cdot|$, and let $f \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree > 1.*

If f has no potentially good reductions, then the following statements are equivalent:

(i) $f \in K[z]$;
(ii) $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$, $f(\infty) = \infty$, *and* $\mu_f = \nu_\infty$ *on* P^1.

If in addition K is archimedean, then (*i*) *and* (*ii*) *are also equivalent to*

(iii) $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$, $f(D_\infty) = D_\infty$, *and* $\mu_f = \nu_\infty$ *on* P^1.

If f has a potentially good reduction, then $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$ and $\mu_f = \nu_\infty$ on P^1.

For non-archimedean K, even if f has no potentially good reductions, (iii) does not necessarily imply (ii); see Remark 4.5.

For archimedean K, the equivalence between (i) and (ii) is due to Lopes [18] (see also Lalley [16, §6] for another proof of Lopes's theorem, and also Oba–Pitcher [21, Theorem 6] and Mañé–Da Rocha [19] for related studies for archimedean K), and the stronger equivalence between (i) and (iii) was established by the present authors in [25, Theorem 1]. All the arguments by Lopes, Lalley, and the present authors were based on a certain *identity theorem for real-analytic curves* in $\mathbb{C}$ (cf. [20]), which does not work for non-archimedean K.

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on a potential theory on P^1, which has been, for non-archimedean K, developed by Baker–Rumely [3], Favre–Jonsson [11], Favre–Rivera-Letelier [12], and Thuillier [29].

Organization of this article. In Sections 2 and 3, we prepare a background material from potential theory and dynamics, respectively. In Section 4, we show Theorem 1. We also analyze what is the best scenario in the case when K is non-archimedean and f has no potentially good reductions in Remark 4.5.

2. Background from potential theory on P^1

Let K be an algebraically closed field that is complete with respect to a non-trivial absolute value $|\cdot|$. The norm $|\cdot|$ or K is *non-archimedean* if the strong triangle inequality $|z+w| \le \max\{|z|,|w|\}$ $(z,w \in K)$ holds (and then the equality holds if $|z| \neq |w|$), and is *archimedean* if it is not non-archimedean. For non-archimedean K, let $\mathcal{O}_K := \{z \in K : |z| \le 1\}$ be the ring of K-integers.

Notation 2.1. The origin of K^2 is, possibly ambiguously but simply, also denoted by 0, and π is the canonical projection $K^2 \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{P}^1 = \mathbb{P}^1(K) = K \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $\pi(p_0,p_1) = p_1/p_0$ if $p_0 \neq 0$ and that $\pi(p_0,p_1) = \infty$ if $p_0 = 0$. On K^2, let $\|(p_0,p_1)\|$ be either the maximum norm $\max\{|p_0|,|p_1|\}$ (for non-archimedean K) or the Euclidean one $\sqrt{|p_0|^2+|p_1|^2}$ (for archimedean K). With the wedge product $(p_0,p_1) \wedge (q_0,q_1) := p_0q_1 - p_1q_0$ on $K^2 \times K^2$, the normalized chordal metric $[z,w]$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$ is the function

$$[z,w] := \frac{|p \wedge q|}{\|p\| \cdot \|q\|} (\le 1)$$

on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, where $p \in \pi^{-1}(z), q \in \pi^{-1}(w)$.

For the foundation of Berkovich spaces, see [6]. For the foundation of potential theory on P^1, see [3, §5, §8], [11, §7] (on valuative trees), [12, §3], [29] (on Berkovich curves), [15, §1-§4] (a survey), [30, Chapter III] (on $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$), and [27] (on weighted potential theory and a Gauss variational problem).

In what follows, we adopt a presentation from [23, §2, §3].

2.1. The Berkovich projective line P^1 for non-archimedean K.

In this subsection, we assume that K is non-archimedean.

A subset B in K is called a (K-closed) *disk* in K if $B = \{z \in K : |z-a| \le r\}$ for some $a \in K$ and some $r \ge 0$; then, by the strong triangle inequality, for every $a' \in B$, we have $\{z \in K : |z-a'| \le r\} = B$, and we set $\operatorname{diam} B := r$, which indeed equals the diameter of B with respect to $|\cdot|$ if $r \in |K|$. A sequence (B_n) of disks in K is said to be *non-increasing* if $B_{n+1} \subset B_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

By the strong triangle inequality, *two disks in K either nest or are disjoint.* This alternative for two disks in K extends to that for two non-increasing infinite sequences of disks in K so that they either *infinitely nest* or *are eventually disjoint.* This induces a so called *cofinal* equivalence relation among them. Instead of giving a formal definition of this equivalence relation, we will present some of its practical consequences; each point $a \in K$

is regarded as the cofinal equivalence class of the constant sequence (B_n) of the disks $B_n \equiv \{a\}$ in K (so $\operatorname{diam} B_n \equiv 0$). More generally, for every cofinal equivalence class $\mathcal{S}$ of a non-increasing infinite sequence (B_n) of disks in K, $B_{\mathcal{S}} := \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_n$ is independent of choices of the representative (B_n) of $\mathcal{S}$, and if $B_{\mathcal{S}} \neq \emptyset$, then $B_{\mathcal{S}}$ is still a disk in K, $\mathcal{S}$ is represented by the constant sequence $(\tilde{B}_n)$ of the disks $\tilde{B}_n \equiv B_{\mathcal{S}}$ in K, and we also say $\mathcal{S}$ is represented by the disk $B_{\mathcal{S}}$ itself in this case. For example, the *canonical* (*or Gauss*) point $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{can}}$ in P^1 is represented by the disk $\mathcal{O}_K$ in K. The set $\mathsf{A}^1 = \mathsf{A}^1(K)$ of all cofinal equivalence classes $\mathcal{S}$ of non-increasing infinite sequences of disks in K is nothing but $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$, as a set ([6, p. 17]; see also [3, §2], [12, §3], [4, §6.1]). The A^1 is the *Berkovich* affine line.

The above alternative for two non-increasing infinite sequences of disks in K induces a partial ordering $\succeq$ on P^1; for every $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}' \in \mathsf{P}^1$ satisfying $B_{\mathcal{S}}, B_{\mathcal{S}'} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{S} \succeq \mathcal{S}'$ if and only if $B_{\mathcal{S}} \supset B_{\mathcal{S}'}$ (the description is a little complicated when one of $B_{\mathcal{S}}, B_{\mathcal{S}'}$ equals $\emptyset$). For every $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}' \in \mathsf{P}^1$ satisfying $\mathcal{S} \succeq \mathcal{S}'$, the *segment* between $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ in P^1 is the set of all points $\mathcal{S}'' \in \mathsf{P}^1$ satisfying $\mathcal{S} \succeq \mathcal{S}'' \succeq \mathcal{S}'$, which can be equipped with either the ordering induced by $\succeq$ on P^1 or its opposite one. All those (oriented) segments make P^1 a *tree* in the sense of Jonsson; see [15, §2, Definition 2.2].

The (Gel'fand) topology of P^1 is the *weak* topology on P^1 as a tree. In this topology, (a) a *Berkovich open* disk in P^1 is either a *Berkovich open* disk *in* A^1 written as $\mathsf{D}(\mathcal{S}, a) := \{\mathcal{S}' \in \mathsf{A}^1 : \mathcal{S}' \preceq \mathcal{S}''$ for some $\mathcal{S}'' \in \mathsf{A}^1 \setminus \{\mathcal{S}\}$ satisfying $a \preceq \mathcal{S}'' \preceq \mathcal{S}\}$ for some $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{A}^1$ and some $a \in K$ satisfying $a \preceq \mathcal{S}$ or the complement $\mathsf{D}(\mathcal{S}, \infty) := \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \overline{\mathsf{D}}(\mathcal{S})$ of a *Berkovich closed* disk $\overline{\mathsf{D}}(\mathcal{S}) := \{\mathcal{S}' \in \mathsf{A}^1 : \mathcal{S}' \preceq \mathcal{S}\}$ *in* A^1 for some $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{A}^1$, (b) a *Berkovich connected open* affinoid (or a *simple domain*) in P^1 is the non-empty intersection of some finitely many Berkovich open disks in P^1, and (c) the set of all Berkovich connected open affinoids in P^1 is an open basis of the topology of P^1. For every $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{A}^1$ and every $a \in K$ satisfying $a \preceq \mathcal{S}$, we have $\partial\mathsf{D}(\mathcal{S}, a) = \partial\mathsf{D}(\mathcal{S}, \infty) = \{\mathcal{S}\}$ and both $\mathsf{D}(\mathcal{S}, a)$ and $\mathsf{D}(\mathcal{S}, \infty)$ are connected components of $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\mathcal{S}\}$, and every Berkovich connected open affinoid in P^1 is indeed connected. Moreover, P^1 is compact, Hausdorff, and uniquely arcwise connected, and contains both $\mathbb{P}^1$ and the *hyperbolic space*

$$\mathsf{H}^1 = \mathsf{H}^1(K) := \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \mathbb{P}^1$$

as dense subsets (cf. [3, §2.2]). Although the topology on P^1 is not always metrizable, the relative topology on $\mathbb{P}^1$ as a subset of P^1 coincides with the topology on $\mathbb{P}^1$ induced by the normalized chordal metric $[z, w]$.

For each $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$, we set $\operatorname{diam} \mathcal{S} := \lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{diam} B_n$, where (B_n) is a representative of $\mathcal{S}$. This $\operatorname{diam} \mathcal{S}$ is well-defined, equals $\operatorname{diam} B_{\mathcal{S}}$ if $B_{\mathcal{S}} \neq \emptyset$, and is positive if and only if $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{H}^1$. The *big model* (*or hyperbolic*) *metric* ρ on H^1 is a path metric on H^1 so that for every $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}' \in \mathsf{H}^1$ satisfying $\mathcal{S} \succeq \mathcal{S}'$, $\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}') = \log(\operatorname{diam} \mathcal{S} / \operatorname{diam} \mathcal{S}')$ (see, e.g., [3, §2.7]). The topology on H^1 induced by ρ is stronger than the relative topology on H^1 as a subset in P^1, and will not be used in this article.

2.2. The action of rational functions on P^1.

Let $\phi \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree $d_0 \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. The action of ϕ on $\mathbb{P}^1$ uniquely extends to a continuous endomorphism on P^1. If $d_0 > 0$, then the action of ϕ on

P^1 is surjective and open, has discrete fibers, and preserves both $\mathbb{P}^1$ and H^1 for non-archimedean K, and the *local degree* function $z \mapsto \deg_z \phi$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$ also canonically extends to P^1 so that $\sum_{\mathcal{S}' \in \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{S})} \deg_{\mathcal{S}'} \phi = d_0$ for every $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1$. Let $\delta_{\mathcal{S}}$ be the Dirac measure on P^1 at an arbitrary point $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1$. If $d_0 > 0$, then the action of ϕ on P^1 induces the push-forward ϕ_* and the pullback ϕ^* on the space of all continuous functions on P^1 and, by duality, those of all Radon measures on P^1; more concretely, for every continuous test function h on P^1, $(\phi_* h)(\cdot) = \sum_{\mathcal{S}' \in \phi^{-1}(\cdot)} (\deg_{\mathcal{S}'} \phi) \cdot h(\mathcal{S}')$ on P^1 and, for every $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1$, $\phi^* \delta_{\mathcal{S}} = \sum_{\mathcal{S}' \in \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{S})} (\deg_{\mathcal{S}'} \phi) \cdot \delta_{\mathcal{S}'}$ on P^1 (see [3, §9], [13, §2.2]).

Fact 2.2. For non-archimedean K, if $\phi \in K[z]$ and is of degree > 0, then the preimage of a Berkovich open disk in A^1 under ϕ consists of finitely many components, each of which is a Berkovich open disk in A^1 (cf. [3, Lemma 9.12]).

2.3. **Generalized Hsia kernels on P^1.** For non-archimedean K, the *generalized Hsia kernel* $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathrm{can}}$ on P^1 *with respect to* $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{can}}$ is the unique (jointly) upper semicontinuous and separately continuous extension of the function $(z, w) \mapsto [z, w]$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ to $\mathsf{P}^1 \times \mathsf{P}^1$; the function $\log[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathrm{can}}$ on $\mathsf{H}^1 \times \mathsf{H}^1$ is regarded as a Gromov product on $\mathsf{H}^1 \times \mathsf{H}^1$ in that $\log[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathrm{can}} = -\rho(\mathcal{S}'', \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{can}})$, where $\mathcal{S}''$ is the unique point in H^1 lying between $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$, between $\mathcal{S}'$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{can}}$, and between $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{can}}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ (see [3, §4.4], [12, §3.4]). For archimedean K (so $\mathsf{P}^1 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$), by convention, the kernel $[z, w]_{\mathrm{can}}$ is defined by $[z, w]$.

Fact 2.3. The subgroup U_K defined by either $PSU(2, K)$ (for archimedean K) or $PGL(2, \mathcal{O}_K)$ (for non-archimedean K) in $PGL(2, K)$ acts on $(\mathbb{P}^1, [z, w])$ isometrically (for non-archimedean K, cf. [5, §1]), that is, for every $h \in U_K$, $[h(\mathcal{S}), h(\mathcal{S}')]_{\mathrm{can}} = [\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathrm{can}}$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, which in turn holds on $\mathsf{P}^1 \times \mathsf{P}^1$ by the density of $\mathbb{P}^1$ in P^1 and the separate continuity of both sides on $\mathsf{P}^1 \times \mathsf{P}^1$.

For every $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathsf{P}^1$, define the function

$$[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathcal{S}_0} := \frac{[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathrm{can}}}{[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}_0]_{\mathrm{can}} \cdot [\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{S}_0]_{\mathrm{can}}} \tag{2.1}$$

on $\mathsf{P}^1 \times \mathsf{P}^1$, where for every $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1$, $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}_0]_{\mathcal{S}_0} = [\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{S}]_{\mathcal{S}_0} := 1/[\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{S}_0]_{\mathrm{can}} \in [1, +\infty]$. For non-archimedean K, this is the *generalized Hsia kernel on* P^1 *with respect to* an arbitrary point $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathsf{P}^1$ (see [3, §4.4]).

Fact 2.4. For non-archimedean K, the kernel $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ on P^1 satisfies the strong triangle inequality $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'']_{\mathcal{S}_0} \le \max\{[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathcal{S}_0}, [\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{S}'']_{\mathcal{S}_0}\}$ $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}', \mathcal{S}'' \in \mathsf{P}^1)$, and moreover, the equality holds if $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathcal{S}_0} \neq [\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{S}'']_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ (see [3, Proposition 4.10]).

Note that the difference $\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}'$ itself is not defined unless both $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'$ are in K. However, the function $(z, w) \mapsto |z - w|$ on $K \times K$ has a unique (jointly) upper semicontinuous and separately continuous extension to $\mathsf{A}^1 \times \mathsf{A}^1$, which coincides with $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}') \mapsto [\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_\infty$. We set $|\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}'|_\infty := [\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_\infty$ on $\mathsf{P}^1 \times \mathsf{P}^1$.

Remark 2.5. If K is non-archimedean, then for every $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1$ represented by a disk $\{z \in K : |z - a| \le r\}$ in K for some $a \in K$ and some $r > 0$, we have $\mathsf{D}(\mathcal{S}, a) = \{\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1 : |\mathcal{S} - a|_\infty < r\}$ and $\mathsf{D}(\mathcal{S}, \infty) = \{\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1 : |\mathcal{S} - a|_\infty > r\}$.

We also set $|\mathcal{S}|_\infty := |\mathcal{S} - 0|_\infty$ on P^1, so that for every $P(z) \in K[z]$, the function $\mathcal{S} \mapsto |P(\mathcal{S})|_\infty$ on P^1 restricts to the unique continuous extension of the function $z \mapsto |P(z)|$ on K to A^1 and, if $\deg P > 0$, then

$$|P(\mathcal{S})|_\infty = |c| \cdot \textstyle\prod_{w \in P^{-1}(0)} |\mathcal{S} - w|_\infty^{\deg_w P} \quad \text{on } \mathsf{P}^1,$$

where $c := \lim_{z \to \infty} P(z)/z^{\deg P} \in K \setminus \{0\}$ is the coefficient of the maximal degree term of $P(z) \in K[z]$.

2.4. **The Laplacian Δ on P^1.** Let us denote by Ω_{can} the Dirac measure $\delta_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{can}}}$ on P^1 at $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{can}}$ for non-archimedean K or the Fubini-Study area element ω on $\mathbb{P}^1$ normalized as $\omega(\mathbb{P}^1) = 1$ for archimedean K. Let Δ be the (distributional) Laplacian on P^1 (for the details of the construction for non-archimedean K in terms of ρ on H^1, see [3, §5], [11, §7.7], [29, §3]) normalized so that for every $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1$,

$$\Delta \log[\cdot, \mathcal{S}]_{\mathrm{can}} = \delta_{\mathcal{S}} - \Omega_{\mathrm{can}} \quad \text{on } \mathsf{P}^1$$

(for non-archimedean K, see [3, Example 5.19], [13, §2.4]; in [3] the opposite sign convention on Δ is adopted).

2.5. **Logarithmic potential theory on P^1.** For every $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathsf{P}^1$ and every Radon measure ν on P^1 whose support is in $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_0\}$, the *logarithmic potential* of ν on P^1 with respect to $\mathcal{S}_0$ (or with *pole* $\mathcal{S}_0$ if $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$) is the function

$$p_{\mathcal{S}_0,\nu}(\cdot) := \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \log[\cdot, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathcal{S}_0} \mathrm{d}\nu(\mathcal{S}')$$

on P^1. For every compact subset C in P^1 and every $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus C$, let $D_{\mathcal{S},C}$ be the component of $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus C$ containing $\mathcal{S}$. A non-empty compact subset C in P^1 is *of logarithmic capacity* > 0 *with respect to a point* $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus C$ (or with *pole* $\mathcal{S}_0$ if $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus C$) if the supremum $V_{\mathcal{S}_0}(C)$ of the *logarithmic energy* functional

$$\nu \mapsto I_{\mathcal{S}_0,\nu} := \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} p_{\mathcal{S}_0,\nu} \mathrm{d}\nu \in [-\infty, +\infty)$$

with respect to $\mathcal{S}_0$ (or with *pole* $\mathcal{S}_0$ if $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus C$) is $> -\infty$, where ν ranges over all probability Radon measures on P^1 whose supports are in C. Then, for every $\mathcal{S} \in D_{\mathcal{S}_0,C}$, (we have $D_{\mathcal{S},C} = D_{\mathcal{S}_0,C}$ and) the above $V_{\mathcal{S}}(C)$ is still $> -\infty$, and there is the unique probability Radon measure $\nu_{\mathcal{S},C}$ on P^1 whose support is in C and which satisfies the equality $I_{\mathcal{S},\nu_{\mathcal{S},C}} = V_{\mathcal{S}}(C)$. This measure $\nu_{\mathcal{S},C}$ is called the *equilibrium mass distribution on* C *with respect to* $\mathcal{S}$ (or with *pole* $\mathcal{S}$ if in addition $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{P}^1$), satisfying the inequalities

$$p_{\mathcal{S},\nu_{\mathcal{S},C}} \ge I_{\mathcal{S},\nu_{\mathcal{S},C}} \text{ on } \mathsf{P}^1 \quad \text{and} \quad p_{\mathcal{S},\nu_{\mathcal{S},C}} > I_{\mathcal{S},\nu_{\mathcal{S},C}} \text{ on } D_{\mathcal{S},C},$$

the equality $\operatorname{supp} \nu_{\mathcal{S},C} = \partial D_{\mathcal{S},C}$, and, if in addition $p_{\mathcal{S},\nu_{\mathcal{S},C}}$ is continuous on $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\mathcal{S}\}$, the identity

$$p_{\mathcal{S},\nu_{\mathcal{S},C}} \equiv I_{\mathcal{S},\nu_{\mathcal{S},C}} \quad \text{on } \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_{\mathcal{S},C}$$

(see [3, §6.2, §6.3] for non-archimedean K, and [30, III. §11] for archimedean K, up to isometry on $(\mathbb{P}^1, [z, w])$).

Remark 2.6. **(a)** For every non-empty compact subset $C \subset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$ of logarithmic capacity > 0 with pole ∞ and every $m(z) = az + b \in K[z]$ for some $a \in K \setminus \{0\}$ and some $b \in K$, we have $V_\infty(m(C)) = V_\infty(C) + \log|a|$ and $m_*(\nu_{\infty,C}) = \nu_{\infty,m(C)}$ on P^1. **(b)** By Fact 2.3, for every non-empty compact subset C in P^1 of logarithmic capacity > 0 with pole $z_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus C$ and every $m(z) \in U_K$, we have $V_{m(z_0)}(m(C)) = V_{z_0}(C)$ and $m_*(\nu_{z_0,C}) = \nu_{m(z_0),m(C)}$ on P^1. **(c)** In particular, for every compact subset C in P^1 and every $z_0 \in K \setminus C$, setting $m(z) = 1/(z - z_0) \in PGL(2, K)$, we have $V_\infty(m(C)) = V_{z_0}(C)$ and $m_*(\nu_{z_0,C}) = \nu_{\infty,m(C)}$ on P^1.

Remark 2.7. By Fact 2.4, for every non-empty compact subset C in $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$ and every $z_0 \in D_{C,\infty}$ so close to ∞ that $[z_0, \infty] < \inf_{\mathcal{S} \in C}[\mathcal{S}, z_0]_{\mathrm{can}} (> 0)$, we have $[\cdot, \infty]_{\mathrm{can}} = [\cdot, z_0]_{\mathrm{can}}$ on C, so that $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_\infty = [\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{z_0}$ on $C \times C$, and if in addition C is of logarithmic capacity > 0 with pole ∞, then $V_\infty(C) = V_{z_0}(C)$ and $\nu_{\infty,C} = \nu_{z_0,C}$ on P^1.

Example 2.8. For every $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathsf{H}^1$, the Berkovich closed disk $\overline{\mathsf{D}}(\mathcal{S}_0)$ in A^1 is a compact subset in $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$ of logarithmic capacity > 0 with pole ∞ such that $\partial\overline{\mathsf{D}}(\mathcal{S}_0) = \{\mathcal{S}_0\}$ and that $\nu_{\infty,\overline{\mathsf{D}}(\mathcal{S}_0)} = \delta_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ on P^1.

2.6. **Potential theory on P^1 with a continuous weight.** A *continuous weight g on* P^1 is a continuous function on P^1 such that $\mu^g := \Delta g + \Omega_{\mathrm{can}}$ is a probability Radon measure on P^1. For a continuous weight g on P^1, the *g-potential kernel* on P^1 (the negative of an Arakelov Green kernel function on P^1 relative to μ^g [3, §8.10]) is a (jointly) upper semicontinuous function

$$\Phi_g(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}') := \log[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}']_{\mathrm{can}} - g(\mathcal{S}) - g(\mathcal{S}') \tag{2.2}$$

on $\mathsf{P}^1 \times \mathsf{P}^1$. For every Radon measure ν on P^1, the *g-potential* of ν on P^1 is the function

$$U_{g,\nu}(\cdot) := \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi_g(\cdot, \mathcal{S}')\mathrm{d}\nu(\mathcal{S}')$$

on P^1. The *g-equilibrium energy V_g of* (*the whole*) P^1 is the supremum of the *g-energy* functional

$$\nu \mapsto I_{g,\nu} := \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} U_{g,\nu}\mathrm{d}\nu \in [-\infty, +\infty),$$

where ν ranges over all probability Radon measures on P^1; indeed $V_g \in \mathbb{R}$ since $\int_{\mathsf{P}^1} U_{g,\nu}\mathrm{d}\Omega_{\mathrm{can}} > -\infty$. As in the logarithmic potential theory, there is the unique probability Radon measure ν^g on P^1 such that $I_{g,\nu^g} = V_g$, which is called the *g-equilibrium mass distribution on* P^1, and which satisfies the identity $U_{g,\nu^g} \equiv V_g$ on P^1. Indeed, $\nu^g = \mu^g$ on P^1 (for non-archimedean K, see [3, Theorem 8.67, Proposition 8.70]).

A continuous weight g on P^1 is called a *normalized weight on* P^1 if $V_g = 0$. For a continuous weight g on P^1, $\overline{g} := g + V_g/2$ is the unique normalized weight on P^1 satisfying $\mu^{\overline{g}} = \mu^g$.

3. BACKGROUND FROM DYNAMICS ON P^1

Let K be an algebraically closed field that is complete with respect to a non-trivial absolute value $|\cdot|$. Let $f \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree $d > 1$.

Fact 3.1. The *classical* Julia and Fatou sets, $\mathsf{J}(f)\cap\mathbb{P}^1$ and $\mathsf{F}(f)\cap\mathbb{P}^1$, respectively, of f are also f-totally invariant and, by $f^{-1}(\mathsf{J}(f)\cap\mathbb{P}^1)\subset\mathsf{J}(f)\cap\mathbb{P}^1$ and $E(f)\subset\mathsf{F}(f)$, we have either $\mathsf{J}(f)\cap\mathbb{P}^1=\emptyset$ or $\#(\mathsf{J}(f)\cap\mathbb{P}^1)=+\infty$.

Fact 3.2. For every $m(z)\in PGL(2,K)$, $m\circ f\circ m^{-1}$ has a potentially good reduction if and only if f does.

For a potential-theoretic study of dynamics on $\mathsf{P}^1=\mathsf{P}^1(K)$, see [3, §10], [13, §3] (for non-archimedean K), [15, §5] (a survey), [7, Chapitre VIII] (on $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$). In the following, we adopt a presentation from [23, §8.1].

3.1. The f-equilibrium measure μ_f on P^1.

For each $j\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$, let $K[p_0,p_1]_j$ be the set of all homogeneous elements of $K[p_0,p_1]$ of degree j, as usual. We call $F\in\bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}}(K[p_0,p_1]_j\times K[p_0,p_1]_j)$ a *lift* of f if $\pi\circ F=f\circ\pi$ on $K^2\setminus\{0\}$ and $F^{-1}(0)=\{0\}$; a lift $F=(F_0,F_1)$ of f is unique up to multiplication in $K\setminus\{0\}$ and indeed in $K[p_0,p_1]_d\times K[p_0,p_1]_d$, and setting $d_0:=(f^*\delta_\infty)(\mathsf{P}^1\setminus\{\infty\})$ and $d_1:=(f^*\delta_0)(\mathsf{P}^1\setminus\{\infty\})$ and letting $c_0^F,c_1^F\in K\setminus\{0\}$ be the coefficients of the maximal degree terms of $F_0(1,z),F_1(1,z)\in K[z]$, respectively, the condition $F^{-1}(0)=\{0\}$ is equivalent to

$$\operatorname{Res}F:=(c_0^F)^{d-d_1}\cdot(c_1^F)^{d-d_0}\cdot R(F_0(1,\cdot),F_1(1,\cdot))\neq\emptyset,$$

where $R(P,Q)\in K$ is the resultant of $P(z),Q(z)\in K[z]$ (for the details on the *homogeneous* resultant $\operatorname{Res}F$ of F, see e.g. [28, §2.4]).

Let F be a lift of f. For every $n\in\mathbb{N}$, setting $F^n=F\circ F^{n-1}$ and $F^0:=\mathrm{Id}_{K^2}$, the iteration F^n of F is a lift of f^n, and the function

$$T_{F^n}:=\log\|F^n\|-d^n\cdot\log\|\cdot\|$$

on $K^2\setminus\{0\}$ descends to $\mathbb{P}^1$ and in turn extends continuously to P^1, satisfying the equality $\Delta T_{F^n}=(f^n)^*\Omega_{\mathrm{can}}-d^n\cdot\Omega_{\mathrm{can}}$ on P^1 (see, e.g., [22, Definition 2.8]). The dynamical Green function of F on P^1 is the uniform limit $g_F:=\lim_{n\to\infty}T_{F^n}/d^n$ on P^1, which is a continuous weight on P^1. The remarkable *energy* formula

$$V_{g_F}=-\frac{\log|\operatorname{Res}F|}{d(d-1)}\tag{3.1}$$

was obtained by DeMarco [10] for archimedean K by a dynamical argument, and by Baker–Rumely [2] when f is defined over a number field; see Baker [1, Appendix A] or the present authors [25, Appendix] for a simple and potential-theoretic proof, which works for general K.

The *equilibrium* (*or canonical*) *measure of* f is the probability Radon measure

$$\mu_f:=\Delta g_F+\Omega_{\mathrm{can}}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{(f^n)^*\Omega_{\mathrm{can}}}{d^n}\quad\text{on }\mathsf{P}^1,$$

where the limit is taken in the weak-$*$ sense on P^1. The measure μ_f is independent of the choice of the lift F of f, has no atoms *in* $\mathbb{P}^1$, and satisfies the f-balanced property $f^*\mu_f=d\cdot\mu_f$, as well as the weaker f-invariance $f_*\mu_f=\mu_f$, on P^1 (for non-archimedean K, see [3, §10], [9, §2], [13, §3.1]). Moreover, for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $\mu_{f^n}=\mu_f$ on P^1.

Fact 3.3. For every $m(z)\in\mathrm{PSL}(2,K)$, $\mu_{m\circ f\circ m^{-1}}=m_*\mu_f$ on P^1, $m(\mathsf{J}(f))=\mathsf{J}(m\circ f\circ m^{-1})$, and $m(\mathsf{F}(f))=\mathsf{F}(m\circ f\circ m^{-1})$.

3.2. **The dynamical Green function g_f of f on P^1.** The *dynamical Green function g_f of f on* P^1 is the unique normalized weight on P^1 such that $\mu^{g_f} = \mu_f$. By (3.1) and the equality $g_{cF} = g_F + (\log|c|)/(d-1)$ on P^1 for every $c \in K^*$, there is a lift F of f normalized so that $V_{g_F} = 0$, or equivalently, that $g_F = g_f$ on P^1. Such a normalized lift F is unique up to multiplication in $\{z \in K : |z| = 1\}$. By $g_f = g_F = \lim_{n\to\infty} T_{F^n}/d^n$ on P^1, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $g_{F^n} = g_{f^n} = g_f$ on P^1, $\mu_{f^n} = \mu_f$ on P^1, and $V_{F^n} = V_F = 0$. We also have $g_f \circ f = d \cdot \lim_{n\to\infty} T_{F^{n+1}}/d^{n+1} - T_F = d \cdot g_f - T_F$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$, that is,

$$d \cdot g_f - g_f \circ f = T_F \tag{3.2}$$

on $\mathbb{P}^1$, and in turn on P^1 by the density of $\mathbb{P}^1$ in P^1 and the continuity of both sides on P^1 (cf. [24, Proof of Lemma 2.4]).

3.3. **The root divisor $[f^n = f^k]$ and proximity functions between f and Id.** For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ less than n, let $[f^n = f^k]$ be the divisor on $\mathbb{P}^1$ defined by all roots of the equation $f^n = f^k$ in $\mathbb{P}^1$ taking into account their multiplicities, which is also regarded as the discrete positive Radon measure $\sum_{w \in \mathbb{P}^1 : f^n(w) = f^k(w)} (\mathrm{ord}_w[f^n = f^k]) \cdot \delta_w$ on P^1; in particular, $[f^n = f^k] = (f^k)^*[f^{n-k} = \mathrm{Id}]$ on P^1.

The *chordal* proximity function $z \mapsto [f(z), z]$ between f and Id on $\mathbb{P}^1$ uniquely extends to a continuous function $\mathcal{S} \mapsto [f, \mathrm{Id}]_{\mathrm{can}}(\mathcal{S})$ on P^1; set

$$|f - \mathrm{Id}|_\infty := [f, \mathrm{Id}]_{\mathrm{can}} \cdot [f(\cdot), \infty]_{\mathrm{can}}^{-1} \cdot [\cdot, \infty]_{\mathrm{can}}^{-1} \quad \text{and} \tag{3.3}$$

$$\Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f} := \log[f, \mathrm{Id}]_{\mathrm{can}} - g_f \circ f - g_f \tag{3.4}$$

on P^1 (for more details, see [22, Proposition 2.9, Lemma 2.19, Remark 2.10]).

3.4. **Potential-theoretic lemmas for f.** Recall that a function F from a topological space S to $\{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{R}$ is continuous if $\exp F : S \to [0, +\infty)$ is continuous, where we set $\exp(-\infty) := 0$, as usual.

Lemma 3.4. *For every $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1$,*

$$\Phi_{g_f}(f(\cdot), \mathcal{S}) = U_{g_f, f^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}}(\cdot) \quad \textit{on } \mathsf{P}^1. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. Fix a lift F of f normalized so that $g_F = g_f$ on P^1. Let $w \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and fix $W \in \pi^{-1}(w)$. Choose a sequence $(q^{(j)} = (q_0^{(j)}, q_1^{(j)}))_{j=1}^d$ in $K^2 \setminus \{0\}$ such that $F(p_0, p_1) \wedge W \in K[p_0, p_1]_d$ factors as $F(p_0, p_1) \wedge W = \prod_{j=1}^d ((p_0, p_1) \wedge q^{(j)})$ in $K[p_0, p_1]$, which with (3.2) implies that $\Phi_{g_f}(f(\cdot), w) - U_{g_f, f^*\delta_w}(\cdot) \equiv -(g_f(w) + \log\|W\|) + \sum_{j=1}^d (g_f(\pi(q^{(j)})) + \log\|q^{(j)}\|) =: C$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$, and in turn on P^1 by the density of $\mathbb{P}^1$ in P^1 and the continuity of the (exp of the) both sides on P^1. Integrating both sides against $\mathrm{d}\mu_f$ over P^1, since $\int_{\mathsf{P}^1} U_{g_f, f^*\delta_w} \mathrm{d}\mu_f = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} U_{g_f, \mu_f} \mathrm{d}(f^*\delta_w) = 0$ and $U_{g_f, f_*\mu_f}(w) = U_{g_f, \mu_f}(w) = 0$ by $U_{g_f, \mu_f} \equiv 0$ and $f_*\mu_f = \mu_f$ on P^1, respectively, we have $C = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi_{g_f}(f(\cdot), w) \mathrm{d}\mu_f = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi_{g_f}(w, f(\cdot)) \mathrm{d}\mu_f = U_{g_f, f_*\mu_f}(w) = 0$. This completes the proof of (3.5) in the case $\mathcal{S} = w \in \mathbb{P}^1$.

Fix $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{H}^1$. By the density of $\mathbb{P}^1$ in P^1, there is a sequence (w_n) in $\mathbb{P}^1$ tending to $\mathcal{S}$ as $n \to \infty$. Then $\lim_{n\to\infty} f^*\delta_{w_n} = f^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}$ weakly on P^1 and, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by (3.5) applied to $\mathcal{S} = w_n \in \mathbb{P}^1$, we have $\Phi_{g_f}(f(\cdot), w_n) = U_{g_f, f^*\delta_{w_n}}(\cdot)$

on P^1. Hence, for each $\mathcal{S}' \in \mathsf{H}^1$, by the continuity of both $\Phi_{g_f}(f(\mathcal{S}'), \cdot)$ and $\Phi_{g_f}(\mathcal{S}', \cdot)$ on P^1, we have $\Phi_{g_f}(f(\mathcal{S}'), \mathcal{S}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi_{g_f}(f(\mathcal{S}'), w_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} U_{g_f, f^*\delta_{w_n}}(\mathcal{S}') = U_{g_f, f^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathcal{S}')$. This completes the proof of (3.5) by the density of H^1 in P^1 and the continuity of both $\Phi_{g_f}(f(\cdot), \mathcal{S})$ and $U_{g_f, f^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}}(\cdot)$ on P^1. □

Lemma 3.5. *On* P^1,

$$\Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f} = U_{g_f, [f=\mathrm{Id}]}. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. Fix a lift F of f normalized so that $g_F = g_f$ on P^1. Choose a sequence $(q_j)_{j=1}^{d+1}$ in $K^2 \setminus \{0\}$ so that $(F \wedge \mathrm{Id})(p_0, p_1) \in K[p_0, p_1]_{d+1}$ factors as $(F \wedge \mathrm{Id})(p_0, p_1) = \prod_{j=1}^{d+1}((p_0, p_1) \wedge q_j)$ in $K[p_0, p_1]$, which with (3.2) implies that $\Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f} - U_{g_f, [f=\mathrm{Id}]} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{d+1}(g_f(\pi(q_j)) + \log\|q_j\|) =: C$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$, and in turn on P^1 by the density of $\mathbb{P}^1$ in P^1 and the continuity of the (exp of the) both sides on P^1. Integrating both sides against $\mathrm{d}\mu_f$ over P^1, since $\int_{\mathsf{P}^1} U_{g_f, [f=\mathrm{Id}]}\mathrm{d}\mu_f = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} U_{g_f, \mu_f}\mathrm{d}[f = \mathrm{Id}] = 0$ by $U_{g_f, \mu_f} \equiv 0$ on P^1, we have $C = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f}\mathrm{d}\mu_f$, so that we first have $\Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f} = U_{g_f, [f=\mathrm{Id}]} + \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f}\mathrm{d}\mu_f$ on P^1.

Fix $z_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \operatorname{supp}[f = \mathrm{Id}]$. Then using the above equality twice, by $f_*[f = \mathrm{Id}] = [f = \mathrm{Id}]$ on P^1 and (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi_{g_f}(f(z_0), z_0) - \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f}\mathrm{d}\mu_f\\
=&U_{g_f, [f=\mathrm{Id}]}(z_0) = U_{g_f, f_*[f=\mathrm{Id}]}(z_0) = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi_{g_f}(z_0, \cdot)\mathrm{d}(f_*[f = \mathrm{Id}])(\cdot)\\
=&\int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi_{g_f}(z_0, f(\cdot))\mathrm{d}[f = \mathrm{Id}](\cdot) = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} U_{g_f, f^*\delta_{z_0}}\mathrm{d}[f = \mathrm{Id}]\\
=&\int_{\mathsf{P}^1} U_{g_f, [f=\mathrm{Id}]}\mathrm{d}(f^*\delta_{z_0}) = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \left(\Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f} - \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f}\mathrm{d}\mu_f\right)\mathrm{d}(f^*\delta_{z_0})\\
=&\int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f}\mathrm{d}(f^*\delta_{z_0}) - d \cdot \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f}\mathrm{d}\mu_f,
\end{aligned}$$

and moreover, $\int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f}\mathrm{d}(f^*\delta_{z_0}) = U_{g_f, f^*\delta_{z_0}}(z_0) = \Phi_{g_f}(f(z_0), z_0)$ by (3.5). Hence $(d - 1)\int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f}\mathrm{d}\mu_f = 0$. By $d > 1$, we have

$$\int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f}\mathrm{d}\mu_f = 0, \tag{3.7}$$

which completes the proof. □

3.5. The equality $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f = \mathsf{J}(f)$.

We note that $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f \not\subset E(f)$ since μ_f has no atoms in $\mathbb{P}^1$ (see §3.1) and $E(f)$ is at most countable (see §1). The inclusion $\mathsf{J}(f) \subset \operatorname{supp}\mu_f$ holds by $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f \not\subset E(f)$, the definition of $\mathsf{J}(f)$, and the f-balanced property $f^*\mu_f = d \cdot \mu_f$ on P^1, but the reverse inclusion $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f \subset \mathsf{J}(f)$ is not trivial, and neither is the non-emptiness of $\mathsf{J}(f)$.

The following is a weaker version of the so called *equidistribution theorem* of the sequence $((f^n)^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}/d^n)$ of the iterated preimages of a point $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus E(f)$ towards μ_f (Brolin [8], Lyubich [17], Freire–Lopes–Mañé [14] for archimedean K and Favre–Rivera-Letelier [13, Théorèmes] for non-archimedean K).

Proposition 3.6. *For every* $\mathcal{S}\in\operatorname{supp}\mu_f$, $\mu_f=\lim_{n\to\infty}(f^n)^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}/d^n$ *weakly on* P^1.

Proof. We claim that for every $\mathcal{S}\in\mathsf{P}^1$ and every infinite sequence (n_j) in $\mathbb{N}$, $\lim_{j\to\infty}\Phi_{g_f}(f^{n_j}(\cdot),\mathcal{S})/d^{n_j}=0$ μ_f-a.e. on P^1; indeed, for every $\mathcal{S}\in\mathsf{P}^1$ and every $j\in\mathbb{N}$, we have $\sup_{\mathsf{P}^1}\Phi_{g_f}(f^{n_j}(\cdot),\mathcal{S})\le 2\cdot\sup_{\mathsf{P}^1}|g_f|<\infty$. In particular, $\limsup_{j\to\infty}\Phi_{g_f}(f^{n_j}(\cdot),\mathcal{S})/d^{n_j}\le 0$ on P^1. On the other hand, by $f_*\mu_f=\mu_f$ and $U_{g_f,\mu_f}\equiv 0$ on P^1, we also have $\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}\Phi_{g_f}(f^{n_j}(\cdot),\mathcal{S})\mathrm{d}\mu_f(\cdot)=\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}\Phi_{g_f}(\mathcal{S},f^{n_j}(\cdot))\mathrm{d}\mu_f(\cdot)=U_{g_f,(f^{n_j})_*\mu_f}(\mathcal{S})=U_{g_f,\mu_f}(\mathcal{S})=0$. Hence by Fatou's lemma, we also have $0\le\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}(\limsup_{j\to\infty}\Phi_{g_f}(f^{n_j}(\cdot),\mathcal{S})/d^{n_j})\mathrm{d}\mu_f(\cdot)$, and the claim holds.

Fix $\mathcal{S}\in\operatorname{supp}\mu_f$, and let $\nu=\lim_{j\to\infty}(f^{n_j})^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}/d^{n_j}$ be any weak limit point of $((f^n)^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}/d^n)$ on P^1. Then $\operatorname{supp}\nu\subset\operatorname{supp}\mu_f$ by $f^*\mu_f=d\cdot\mu_f$ on P^1. By (3.5), for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $\Phi_{g_f}(f^n(\cdot),\mathcal{S})/d^n=U_{g_f,(f^n)^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}/d^n}(\cdot)$ on P^1, so that by a truncation argument, $\limsup_{j\to\infty}\Phi_{g_f}(f^{n_j}(\cdot),\mathcal{S})/d^{n_j}\le U_{g_f,\nu}(\cdot)$ on P^1. By this and the above claim, we have $U_{g_f,\nu}\ge 0$ on μ_f-a.e. on P^1, and in turn on $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f$ by the upper semicontinuity of $U_{g_f,\nu}$ on P^1. By this and $\operatorname{supp}\nu\subset\operatorname{supp}\mu_f$, we have $I_{g_f,\nu}=\int_{\operatorname{supp}\mu_f}U_{g_f,\nu}\mathrm{d}\nu\ge 0=V_{g_f}$, so that $\nu=\mu^{g_f}=:\mu_f$ on P^1. □

Let us see the inclusion $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f\subset\mathsf{J}(f)$ assuming $\mathsf{J}(f)\neq\emptyset$. Suppose to the contrary that $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f\not\subset\mathsf{J}(f)$. Then $\mu_f(\mathsf{P}^1\setminus\mathsf{J}(f))>0$, so that by the inner regularity of μ_f on open subsets in P^1, there is a non-negative continuous function h on P^1 such that $\operatorname{supp}h\subset\mathsf{P}^1\setminus\mathsf{J}(f)$ and that $\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}h\mathrm{d}\mu_f>0$. Fixing $\mathcal{S}\in\mathsf{J}(f)(\subset\operatorname{supp}\mu_f\cap(\mathsf{P}^1\setminus E(f)))$, by $\operatorname{supp}h\subset\mathsf{P}^1\setminus\mathsf{J}(f)$, $f^{-n}(\mathsf{J}(f))\subset\mathsf{J}(f)$ for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$, and Proposition 3.6, we have

$$0=\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathsf{P}^1\setminus\mathsf{J}(f)}h\mathrm{d}\frac{(f^n)^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}}{d^n}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}h\mathrm{d}\frac{(f^n)^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}}}{d^n}=\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}h\mathrm{d}\mu_f>0,$$

which is a contradiction.

Once the equality $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f=\mathsf{J}(f)$ is at our disposal, then with $\mu_{f^n}=\mu_f$ on P^1 for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$, it will also yield $\mathsf{J}(f^n)=\mathsf{J}(f)$ and $\mathsf{F}(f^n)=\mathsf{F}(f)$ for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$.

Remark 3.7. The full version of the equidistribution theorem, which can also be seen by a purely potential-theoretic argument (see [15]), implies $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f\subset\mathsf{J}(f)$ without assuming $\mathsf{J}(f)\neq\emptyset$, hence it also gives a purely potential-theoretic proof of $\mathsf{J}(f)\neq\emptyset$.

Remark 3.8. By an argument involving the dominated convergence theorem, Proposition 3.6 characterizes μ_f as the unique probability Radon measure ν on P^1 whose support is in $\mathsf{J}(f)$ and which satisfies the f-balanced property $f^*\nu=d\cdot\nu$ on P^1.

Remark 3.9. Suppose that f has a potentially good reduction. Fix $\mathcal{S}_0\in\mathsf{H}^1$ such that $\#\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}f^{-n}(\mathcal{S}_0)<\infty$. Then by $\mathcal{S}_0\notin E(f)(\subset\mathbb{P}^1)$ and $\mathsf{J}(f)\neq\emptyset$, we have $\mathsf{J}(f)\cap\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}f^{-n}(\mathcal{S}_0)\neq\emptyset$, which with $f(\mathsf{J}(f))=\mathsf{J}(f)$ implies that $\mathcal{S}_0\in\mathsf{J}(f)=\operatorname{supp}\mu_f$. On the other hand, by a counting argument, we have $f^{-n_0}(\mathcal{S}_0)=\{\mathcal{S}_0\}$ for some $n_0\in\mathbb{N}$. Hence by Proposition 3.6, we have

$\mu_f = \lim_{j\to\infty}(f^{jn_0})^*\delta_{\mathcal{S}_0}/d^{jn_0} = \lim_{j\to\infty}(d^{jn_0}\cdot\delta_{\mathcal{S}_0})/d^{jn_0} = \delta_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ weakly on P^1, and $\mathsf{J}(f) = \operatorname{supp}\mu_f = \{\mathcal{S}_0\}$. In particular, $f^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_0) = \{\mathcal{S}_0\}$.

4. Proof of Theorem 1

Let K be an algebraically closed field that is complete with respect to a non-trivial absolute value $|\cdot|$. Let $f \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree $d > 1$.

4.1. **Proof of the first two assertions.**

Fix a lift F of f normalized so that $g_F = g_f$ on $\mathsf{P}^1 = \mathsf{P}^1(K)$. Then, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $F^n = ((F^n)_0, (F^n)_1)$ is a lift of f^n satisfying that $g_{F^n} = g_{f^n} = g_f$ on P^1.

Notation 4.1. Set $d_0 := (f^*\delta_\infty)(\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\})$ and $d_1 := (f^*\delta_0)(\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\})$. These numbers equal the degrees of $F_0(1,z), F_1(1,z) \in K[z]$, respectively. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $c_0^{F^n}, c_1^{F^n} \in K \setminus \{0\}$ be the coefficients of the maximal degree terms of $(F^n)_0(1,z), (F^n)_1(1,z) \in K[z]$, respectively.

For an arbitrary probability Radon measure ν whose support is in $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$, we denote $p_{\infty,\nu}$ and $I_{\infty,\nu}$ by p_ν and I_ν, respectively.

Lemma 4.2. *If $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$, then*

$$I_{\mu_f} = -2\cdot g_f(\infty) > -\infty, \tag{4.1}$$

$$p_{\mu_f} = g_f - \log[\cdot,\infty]_{\mathrm{can}} + I_{\mu_f}/2 \quad \text{on } \mathsf{P}^1, \text{ and} \tag{4.2}$$

$$\Phi_{g_f}(\cdot,\infty) = -p_{\mu_f} + I_{\mu_f} \quad \text{on } \mathsf{P}^1. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. If $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$, then $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f = \mathsf{J}(f) \subset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$ and $0 = V_{g_f} = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1\times\mathsf{P}^1}\Phi_{g_f}\mathrm{d}(\mu_f\times\mu_f) = I_{\mu_f} - 2\cdot\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}(g_f - \log[\cdot,\infty]_{\mathrm{can}})\mathrm{d}\mu_f$, so that $I_{\mu_f} = 2\cdot\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}(g_f - \log[\cdot,\infty]_{\mathrm{can}})\mathrm{d}\mu_f$, which with $0 \equiv U_{g_f,\mu_f} = p_{\mu_f} - (g_f - \log[\cdot,\infty]_{\mathrm{can}}) - \int_{\mathsf{P}^1}(g_f - \log[\cdot,\infty]_{\mathrm{can}})\mathrm{d}\mu_f$ on P^1 yields (4.2). By (4.2) and $\log[z,\infty] = \log[z,0] - \log|z|$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$, we have $g_f(\infty) = \lim_{z\to\infty}((p_{\mu_f}(z) - \log|z|) + \log[z,0]) - I_{\mu_f}/2 = -I_{\mu_f}/2$, so (4.1) holds. By (4.1) and (4.2), we have $\Phi_{g_f}(\cdot,\infty) = \log[\cdot,\infty]_{\mathrm{can}} - g_f - g_f(\infty) = (-p_{\mu_f} + I_{\mu_f}/2) + I_{\mu_f}/2 = -p_{\mu_f} + I_{\mu_f}$ on P^1, so (4.3) also holds. □

Lemma 4.3. *If $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$, then*

$$\log|F_0(1,\cdot)|_\infty = d\cdot p_{\mu_f} - p_{\mu_f}\circ f - (d-1)I_{\mu_f}/2 \tag{4.4}$$

on $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus (\{\infty\} \cup f^{-1}(\infty))$.

Proof. By $[z,\infty] = 1/\|(1,z)\|$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_F &= \log\|(1,f(z))\| + \log|F_0(1,z)| - d\cdot\log\|(1,z)\| \\ &= -\log[f(\cdot),\infty] + \log|F_0(1,\cdot)| + d\cdot\log[\cdot,\infty] \end{aligned}$$

on $\mathbb{P}^1\setminus(\{\infty\}\cup f^{-1}(\infty))$, and in turn on $\mathsf{P}^1\setminus(\{\infty\}\cup f^{-1}(\infty))$ by the density of $\mathbb{P}^1$ in P^1 and the continuity of both sides on $\mathsf{P}^1\setminus(\{\infty\}\cup f^{-1}(\infty))$. By this and (3.2), we have $d\cdot(g_f - \log[\cdot,\infty]_{\mathrm{can}}) - (g_f\circ f - \log[f(\cdot),\infty]_{\mathrm{can}}) = \log|F_0(1,\cdot)|_\infty$ on $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus (\{\infty\} \cup f^{-1}(\infty))$, which with (4.2) yields (4.4) if $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$. □

Lemma 4.4. *If $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$ and $f(\infty) = \infty$, then*

$$\log|c_1^F| = -(d-1)I_{\mu_f}/2. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. If $f(\infty)=\infty$, then $F(0,1)=(0,c_1^F)$, so that by the homogeneity of F, for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $F^n(0,1)=(0,(c_1^F)^{(d^n-1)/(d-1)})$. Hence

$$g_f(\infty)=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{T_{F^n}(\infty)}{d^n}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log\|F^n(0,1)\|}{d^n}-\log\|(0,1)\|=\frac{\log|c_1^F|}{d-1},$$

which with (4.1) completes the proof if in addition $\infty\in\mathsf{F}(f)$. □

When $\infty\in\mathsf{F}(f)$ and $f(D_\infty)=D_\infty$, note that by (4.2), we have

$$\Phi_{g_f}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{S}')=\log|\mathcal{S}-\mathcal{S}'|_\infty-p_{\mu_f}(\mathcal{S})-p_{\mu_f}(\mathcal{S}')+I_{\mu_f}\quad\text{on }\mathsf{P}^1\times\mathsf{P}^1 \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\Phi(f,\mathrm{Id})_{g_f}=\log|f-\mathrm{Id}|_\infty-p_{\mu_f}\circ f-p_{\mu_f}+I_{\mu_f}\quad\text{on }\mathsf{P}^1, \tag{4.7}$$

and that by $\operatorname{supp}\mu_f=\mathsf{J}(f)\subset\mathsf{P}^1\setminus D_\infty$ and (4.1), there is the unique equilibrium mass distribution $\nu_\infty=\nu_{\infty,\mathsf{P}^1\setminus D_\infty}$ on $\mathsf{P}^1\setminus D_\infty$. If in addition $\mu_f=\nu_\infty$ on P^1, then we have not only $p_{\mu_f}=p_{\nu_\infty}>I_{\nu_\infty}=I_{\mu_f}$ on D_∞ but, by the continuity of p_{μ_f} on $\mathsf{P}^1\setminus\{\infty\}$ (see (4.2)), also $p_{\mu_f}=p_{\nu_\infty}\equiv I_{\nu_\infty}=I_{\mu_f}$ on $\mathsf{P}^1\setminus D_\infty$; in particular, by (4.4),

$$\log|F_0(1,\cdot)|_\infty\equiv(d-1)I_{\mu_f}/2\quad\text{on }\mathsf{P}^1\setminus f^{-1}(D_\infty)\quad\text{and} \tag{4.8}$$

$$\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}\log|F_0(1,\cdot)|_\infty\mathrm{d}\mu_f=(d-1)I_{\mu_f}/2. \tag{4.9}$$

The latter is equivalent to

$$\log|c_0^F|=-\int_{\mathsf{P}^1\setminus\{\infty\}}p_{\mu_f}\mathrm{d}(f^*\delta_\infty)+(d-1)I_{\mu_f}/2. \tag{4.10}$$

Proof of “(ii)⇒(i) when f has no potentially good reductions”. Suppose that $\infty\in\mathsf{F}(f)$, that $f(\infty)=\infty$, that $\mu_f=\nu_\infty$ on P^1, and that f has no potentially good reductions. Then $f(D_\infty)=D_\infty$. Without loss of generality, by (4.5), **(a)** in Remark 2.6, and Facts 3.2 and 3.3, we can normalize f so that

$$I_{\mu_f}=I_{\nu_\infty}=0.$$

Claim 1. $f^{-1}(\infty)\subset D_\infty$.

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $f^{-1}(\infty)\setminus D_\infty\neq\emptyset$. Then $d_0>0$.

Let U_∞ be the component of $\{\mathcal{S}\in\mathsf{P}^1:|F_0(1,\mathcal{S})|_\infty\neq1\}$ containing ∞, which agrees with $\{\mathcal{S}\in\mathsf{P}^1:|F_0(1,\mathcal{S})|_\infty>1\}$. Under the normalization $I_{\mu_f}=0$, by (4.8), we have $U_\infty\subset f^{-1}(D_\infty)$, and then $U_\infty\subset D_\infty$. For every $w\in f^{-1}(\infty)\setminus D_\infty$, let U_w and D_w be the component of $\{\mathcal{S}\in\mathsf{P}^1:|F_0(1,\mathcal{S})|_\infty<1\}$ containing w and the component of $f^{-1}(D_\infty)$ containing w, respectively, so that for every $w\in f^{-1}(\infty)\setminus D_\infty$, we have $\partial U_w\subset\partial U_\infty$, $D_\infty\cap D_w=\emptyset$, and $U_w\subset D_w$ by (4.8).

We first claim that for every $w\in f^{-1}(\infty)\setminus D_\infty$, $U_w=D_w$; otherwise, we would have $\partial U_w\cap D_w\neq\emptyset$, so that $U_\infty\cap D_w\neq\emptyset$ by $\partial U_w\subset\partial U_\infty$, which with $U_\infty\subset D_\infty$ contradicts $D_\infty\cap D_w=\emptyset$. We next claim that for every $w\in f^{-1}(\infty)\setminus D_\infty$, $\partial U_w\subset\partial D_\infty$; otherwise, by $\bigcup_{w\in f^{-1}(\infty)\setminus D_\infty}\partial U_w\subset\partial U_\infty\subset\overline{D_\infty}$, there must exist $w\in f^{-1}(\infty)\setminus D_\infty$ such that $D_\infty\cap\partial U_w\neq\emptyset$, so that $D_\infty\cap U_w\neq\emptyset$, which with $U_w\subset D_w$ contradicts $D_\infty\cap D_w=\emptyset$.

Suppose first that K is non-archimedean. For every $w \in f^{-1}(\infty) \setminus D_\infty$, $D_w = U_w$ is a Berkovich open disk in A^1 (by Fact 2.2), so by $f(D_w) = D_\infty$, we have $\partial D_\infty = f(\partial D_w) = \{\mathcal{S}_\infty\}$ for some $\mathcal{S}_\infty \in \mathsf{H}^1$, which with $D_w = U_w$ and $\partial U_w \subset \partial D_\infty$ also yields $\partial D_w = \{\mathcal{S}_\infty\}$. Recall that $\mu_{f^2} = \mu_f$ on P^1, so that ($\mathsf{J}(f^2) = \mathsf{J}(f)$, $\mathsf{F}(f^2) = \mathsf{F}(f)$, and) $D_\infty(f^2) = D_\infty(f)$. Fixing $w \in f^{-1}(\infty) \setminus D_\infty$ and applying the above argument to f^2 and every $w' \in f^{-1}(w)(\subset f^{-2}(\infty) \setminus D_\infty$ by $f(D_\infty) = D_\infty)$, we still have $\partial D^{(2)}_{w'} = \{\mathcal{S}_\infty\}$, where $D^{(2)}_{w'}$ is the component of $f^{-2}(D_\infty)$ containing w', or equivalently, that of $f^{-1}(D_w)$ containing w'. Then $f^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_\infty) = f^{-1}(\partial D_w) \subset \bigcup_{w' \in f^{-1}(w)} \partial D^{(2)}_{w'} = \{\mathcal{S}_\infty\}$, which contradicts that f has no potentially good reductions. Now the proof is complete for non-archimedean K.

Suppose next that K is archimedean. Under the assumption $f^{-1}(\infty) \not\subset D_\infty$, we have $f^{-1}(D_\infty) \setminus D_\infty \neq \emptyset$, and then $\mathsf{F}(f) \setminus f^{-1}(D_\infty) \neq \emptyset$ by $f(D_\infty) = D_\infty$. By (4.8), we also have $\mathsf{F}(f) \setminus f^{-1}(D_\infty) \subset \{\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1 : |F_0(1, \cdot)|_\infty = 1\}$. Since the interior of $\{\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1 : |\mathcal{S}|_\infty = 1\}$ is empty for archimedean K, this contradicts the fact that $F_0(1, \cdot)$ is an open endomorphism on P^1 by $d_0 > 0$, and the proof is complete for archimedean K. □

By (4.10), Claim 1, and $p_{\mu_f} > 0$ on D_∞ (under the normalization $I_{\mu_f} = 0$),

$$|c_0^F| < 1. \tag{4.11}$$

Claim 2. $(\mathrm{supp}[f = \mathrm{Id}]) \setminus \{\infty\} \subset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$.

Proof. We start by proving that $\int_{\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}} p_{\mu_f} \mathrm{d}[f = \mathrm{Id}] = 0$ (under the normalization $I_{\mu_f} = 0$). Recalling the assumption $f(\infty) = \infty$, we set $\lambda := f'(\infty)$. Then $|\lambda| < 1$; indeed, if $d-1 > d_0$, then, equivalently $\lambda = 0$, and the inequality is obvious. If $d_0 = d-1$, or equivalently, $\lambda \neq 0$, then by (4.5) and (4.11), we also have $|1/\lambda| = \lim_{z \to \infty} |f(z)/z| = |c_1^F|/|c_0^F| = 1/|c_0^F| > 1$.

Hence for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(f^n)'(\infty) = \lambda^n \neq 1$, or equivalently, $\mathrm{ord}_\infty[f^n = \mathrm{Id}] = 1$, and then

$$\begin{aligned}
\log|\lambda^n - 1| &= \lim_{w \to 0} \log \left| \frac{1/(f^n(1/w)) - 0 - (w - 0)}{w - 0} \right| \\
&= \lim_{w \to 0} \log \frac{[1/(f^n(1/w)), w]}{[w, 0]} \quad (\text{by } f^n(\infty) = \infty) \\
&= \lim_{z \to \infty} \log \frac{[f^n(z), z]}{[z, \infty]} \quad (\text{by } m(z) := 1/z \in U_K) \\
&= \lim_{z \to \infty} (\Phi_{g_f}(f^n(z), z) - \Phi_{g_f}(z, \infty)) \quad (\text{by } f^n(\infty) = \infty) \\
&= \lim_{z \to \infty} \int_{\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}} \Phi_{g_f}(z, \cdot) \mathrm{d}[f^n = \mathrm{Id}] \quad (\text{by (3.6) applied to } f^n) \\
&= \int_{\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}} \Phi_{g_f}(\infty, \cdot) \mathrm{d}[f^n = \mathrm{Id}] \\
&= -\int_{\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}} p_{\mu_f} \mathrm{d}[f^n = \mathrm{Id}] \quad (\text{by (4.3)}).
\end{aligned}$$

This with $p_{\mu_f} \geq 0$ on P^1, $\operatorname{supp}[f = \mathrm{Id}] \subset \operatorname{supp}[f^n = \mathrm{Id}]$, and $|\lambda| < 1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}0 \leq \int_{\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}} p_{\mu_f} \mathrm{d}[f = \mathrm{Id}] &\leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}} p_{\mu_f} \mathrm{d}[f^n = \mathrm{Id}] \\ &= - \lim_{n \to \infty} \log |\lambda^n - 1| = - \log |0 - 1| = 0,\end{aligned}$$

that is, $\int_{\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}} p_{\mu_f} \mathrm{d}[f = \mathrm{Id}] = 0$. Once this equality is at our disposal, recalling that $p_{\mu_f} \geq 0$ on P^1 and that $p_{\mu_f} = 0$ holds only on $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$, we have $(\operatorname{supp}[f = \mathrm{Id}]) \setminus \{\infty\} \subset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$. □

Let us complete the proof of "(ii)⇒(i) when f has no potentially good reductions". Suppose to the contrary that $d_0 > 0$. By the assumption $f(\infty) = \infty$, f satisfies $d_1 = d > d_0$ and $\deg_\infty f = d - d_0$, and f^2 satisfies $f^2(\infty) = \infty$, $\deg_\infty(f^2) = (d - d_0)^2$, $\deg((F^2)_1(1, \cdot)) = d^2$, and $\deg((F^2)_0(1, \cdot)) = ((f^2)^* \delta_\infty)(\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}) = d^2 - (d - d_0)^2$; in particular, we must have

$$\begin{aligned}\deg((F^2)_1(1, \cdot) F_0(1, \cdot)) - \deg(F_1(1, \cdot)(F^2)_0(1, \cdot)) \\ = d \cdot d_0 \cdot (d_0 - d) < 0.\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Recall that $\mu_{f^2} = \mu_f$ on P^1, so that ($\mathsf{J}(f^2) = \mathsf{J}(f)$, $\mathsf{F}(f^2) = \mathsf{F}(f)$, and) $D_\infty(f^2) = D_\infty(f)$. By $[f^2 = f] = f^*[f = \mathrm{Id}]$ on P^1 and Claim 2, we have $\operatorname{supp}[f^2 = f] \setminus \{\infty\} \subset f^{-1}(\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty) (\subset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$ by $f(D_\infty) = D_\infty)$. Hence, under the normalization $I_{\mu_f} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \Phi(f, \mathrm{Id})_{g_f} \mathrm{d}\mu_f \quad ((3.7)) \\ &= \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \log |f - \mathrm{Id}|_\infty \mathrm{d}\mu_f \quad (\text{by } (4.7) \text{ and } f_* \mu_f = \mu_f) \\ &= \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \log |f^2 - f|_\infty \mathrm{d}\mu_f \quad (\text{by } f_* \mu_f = \mu_f) \\ &= \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \log |(F^2)_1(1, \cdot) F_0(1, \cdot) - F_1(1, \cdot)(F^2)_0(1, \cdot)|_\infty \mathrm{d}\mu_f \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \log |(F^2)_0(1, \cdot)|_\infty \mathrm{d}\mu_f - \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \log |F_0(1, \cdot)|_\infty \mathrm{d}\mu_f \\ &= \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} \log |(F^2)_1(1, \cdot) F_0(1, \cdot) - F_1(1, \cdot)(F^2)_0(1, \cdot)|_\infty \mathrm{d}\mu_f \\ &\qquad (\text{by } (4.9) \text{ applied to } f \text{ and } f^2) \\ &= \int_{\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}} p_{\mu_f} \mathrm{d}[f^2 = f] + \log |c_1^F \cdot c_0^{F^2}| \quad (\text{by } (4.12)) \\ &= \log |c_0^{F^2}| \quad (\text{by } \operatorname{supp}[f^2 = f] \setminus \{\infty\} \subset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty \text{ and } (4.5)),\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (4.11) applied to f^2 (and F^2). □

Proof of "(iii)⇔(ii) for archimedean K". It is clear that (iii)⇐(ii) no matter whether K is archimedean. Let us show (iii)⇒(ii) for archimedean K, using "(ii)⇒(i) when f has no potentially good reductions". Suppose that $\infty \in D_\infty$, that $f(D_\infty) = D_\infty$, that $\mu_f = \nu_\infty$ on P^1, and that K is archimedean. Then $K \cong \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathsf{P}^1 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, so in particular $\mathsf{J}(f) = \mathsf{J}(f) \cap \mathbb{P}^1$, and f has no potentially good reductions.

Claim 3 (see [19, p. 253])**.** *$\nu_{f(\infty),D_\infty}=\mu_f$ on P^1.*

Proof. For every continuous function h on $\partial D_\infty=\operatorname{supp}\nu_\infty=\operatorname{supp}\mu_f=\mathsf{J}(f)$, the generalized Poisson integral $z\mapsto(P_{D_\infty}h)(z):=\int_{\partial D_\infty}h\mathrm{d}\nu_{z,D_\infty}$ on D_∞ is the unique solution $H_{D_\infty}h$ of the Dirichlet problem given h and D_∞ (cf. [26, §4.1, §4.3]), so that $P_{D_\infty}(f^*h)\equiv f^*(P_{D_\infty}h)$ on D_∞, or equivalently, $\int_{\partial D_\infty}h\mathrm{d}(f_*(\nu_{\cdot,D_\infty}))=(P_{D_\infty}(f^*h))(\cdot)=(P_{D_\infty}h)(f(\cdot))=\int_{\partial D_\infty}h\mathrm{d}\nu_{f(\cdot),D_\infty}$ on D_∞. In particular, $f_*(\nu_\infty)=\nu_{f(\infty),D_\infty}$ on P^1, which with the assumption $\mu_f=\nu_\infty$ on P^1 and the f-invariance of μ_f completes the proof. □

Claim 4. *If $f(\infty)\neq\infty$, then we have $\mathbb{P}^1\setminus D_\infty\subset\{z\in\mathbb{P}^1:|z-f(\infty)|=e^{-(d-1)I_{\mu_f}/2}/|c_0^F|\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $f(\infty)\neq\infty$, or equivalently, that $d_0=d$. Then for every $a\in\mathbb{P}^1\setminus\{\infty,f(\infty)\}$, we have $\deg(F_1(1,\cdot)-a\cdot F_0(1,\cdot))=(f^*\delta_a)(\mathsf{P}^1\setminus\{\infty\})=d$, and the coefficient of the maximal degree term of $F_1(1,\cdot)-a\cdot F_0(1,\cdot)$ equals $c_0^F(f(\infty)-a)$. Hence, for every $z\in\mathbb{P}^1\setminus D_\infty(\subset\mathbb{P}^1\setminus\{\infty,f(\infty)\}$ by $f(D_\infty)=D_\infty)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\mu_f}=&U_{g_f,\mu_f}(z)+I_{\mu_f}\quad(\text{by }U_{g_f,\mu_f}\equiv V_F=0\text{ on }\mathsf{P}^1)\\
=&\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}\Phi_{g_f}(z,\cdot)\mathrm{d}\mu_f+I_{\mu_f}\\
=&\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}\log|z-\cdot|_\infty\mathrm{d}\mu_f\quad(\text{by (4.6) and }p_{\mu_f}\equiv I_{\mu_f}\text{ on }\mathbb{P}^1\setminus D_\infty)\\
=&\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}\log|f(\cdot)-z|_\infty\mathrm{d}\mu_f\quad(\text{by }f_*\mu_f=\mu_f)\\
=&\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}\log|F_1(1,\cdot)-z\cdot F_0(1,\cdot)|_\infty\mathrm{d}\mu_f-\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}\log|F_0(1,\cdot)|_\infty\mathrm{d}\mu_f\\
=&\int_{\mathsf{P}^1}\log|F_1(1,\cdot)-z\cdot F_0(1,\cdot)|_\infty\mathrm{d}\mu_f-(d-1)I_{\mu_f}/2\quad(\text{by (4.9)})\\
=&\int_{\mathsf{P}^1\setminus\{\infty\}}p_{\mu_f}\mathrm{d}(f^*\delta_z)+\log|c_0^F(f(\infty)-z)|-(d-1)I_{\mu_f}/2\\
=&d\cdot I_{\mu_f}+\log|c_0^F(z-f(\infty))|-(d-1)I_{\mu_f}/2\quad(\text{by }f^{-1}(z)\in\mathbb{P}^1\setminus D_\infty),
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

Let us complete the proof of "(iii)⇒(ii) for archimedean K". Suppose to the contrary that $f(\infty)\neq\infty$. Set $m(z)=1/(z-f(\infty))\in PGL(2,K)$. Recall that $\mu_{f^2}=\mu_f$ on P^1 and that ($\mathsf{J}(f^2)=\mathsf{J}(f)$, $\mathsf{F}(f^2)=\mathsf{F}(f)$, and) $D_\infty(f^2)=D_\infty(f)(=D_\infty)$.

If also $f^2(\infty)\neq\infty$, then we can apply Claim 4 to both f and f^2, so that since $\#(\mathsf{P}^1\setminus D_\infty)\geq\#\mathsf{J}(f)=+\infty$ (see Remark 3.1), we have $f^2(\infty)=f(\infty)$, that is, $f(f(\infty))=f(\infty)$. By this, Claim 3, **(c)** in Remark 2.6, and Fact 3.3, we can apply "(ii)⇒(i)" to $m\circ f\circ m^{-1}\in K(z)$, so that $m\circ f\circ m^{-1}\in K[z]$. In particular, $(m\circ f\circ m^{-1})^{-1}(\infty)=\{\infty\}$, or equivalently, $(\infty\in)f^{-1}(f(\infty))=\{f(\infty)\}$, which contradicts the assumption $f(\infty)\neq\infty$.

Hence we must have $f^2(\infty)=\infty$, and then also $f^2(f(\infty))=f(\infty)$. By $f^2(\infty)=\infty$, we can apply "(ii)⇒(i)" to f^2, so that $f^2\in K[z]$. By $f^2(f(\infty))=f(\infty)$, Claim 3, **(c)** in Remark 2.6, Fact 3.3, we can also apply "(ii)$\Rightarrow$(i)" to $m \circ f^2 \circ m^{-1} \in K(z)$, so that $m \circ f^2 \circ m^{-1} \in K[z]$. Hence $f^2(z) = f(\infty) + a(z - f(\infty))^{d^2} \in K[z]$ for some $a \in K \setminus \{0\}$, which with the assumption $f(\infty) \neq \infty$ implies that $f(z) = f(\infty) + b(z - f(\infty))^{-d}$ for some $b \in K \setminus \{0\}$ satisfying $b^{1-d} = a$. Then $\mathsf{F}(f)$ must consist of exactly two components, one of which is D_∞ and the other, say $D_{f(\infty)}$, contains $f(\infty)$. Then $f(D_\infty) = D_{f(\infty)}$, which with the assumption $f(D_\infty) = D_\infty$ implies $D_\infty = D_{f(\infty)}$. This is a contradiction. $\Box$

4.2. **Proof of "(i)$\Rightarrow$(ii) no matter whether f has no potentially good reductions".** Suppose that $f(z) \in K[z]$. Then $f(\infty) = \infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$, and by $f^{-1}(\infty) = \{\infty\}$, we even have $f(\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty) \subset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$. Set $\tilde{F}(p_0, p_1) := (p_0^d, p_0^d \cdot f(p_1/p_0)) \in K[p_0, p_1]_d \times K[p_0, p_1]_d$, which is a lift of f (but $g_{\tilde{F}}$ does not necessarily coincide with g_f). For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{F}^n(1, z) = (1, f^n(z))$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$, so that $T_{\tilde{F}^n} = -\log[f^n(\cdot), \infty]_{\mathrm{can}} + d^n \cdot \log[\cdot, \infty]_{\mathrm{can}}$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$, and in turn on A^1 by the density of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$ in A^1 and the continuity of both sides on A^1. Hence $g_{\tilde{F}} = -\lim_{n\to\infty}(\log[f^n(\cdot), \infty]_{\mathrm{can}})/d^n + \log[\cdot, \infty]_{\mathrm{can}}$ on A^1, so that by $\inf_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty}[\mathcal{S}, \infty]_{\mathrm{can}} > 0$ and $f(\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty) \subset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$, we have $g_{\tilde{F}} \equiv \log[\cdot, \infty]_{\mathrm{can}}$ on $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$ This with (4.2) and $g_f = g_{\tilde{F}} + V_{\tilde{F}}/2$ on P^1 implies that $p_{\mu_f} \equiv V_{\tilde{F}}/2 + I_{\mu_f}/2$ on $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$, and then by $\operatorname{supp} \mu_f = \mathsf{J}(f) \subset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$, we indeed have $p_{\mu_f} \equiv \int_{\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty} p_{\mu_f} \mathrm{d}\mu_f = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} p_{\mu_f} \mathrm{d}\mu_f = I_{\mu_f}$ on $\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$. By this and $\operatorname{supp} \nu_\infty \subset \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty$, using Fubini's theorem, we have $I_{\mu_f} = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty} p_{\mu_f} \mathrm{d}\nu_\infty = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} p_{\mu_f} \mathrm{d}\nu_\infty = \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} p_{\nu_\infty} \mathrm{d}\mu_f \geq \int_{\mathsf{P}^1} I_{\nu_\infty} \mathrm{d}\mu_f = I_{\nu_\infty}$, so that $\mu_f = \nu_\infty$ on P^1. $\Box$

Now the proof of the first two assertions in Theorem 1 are complete.

Remark 4.5. For non-archimedean K, (iii) does not necessarily imply (ii) in Theorem 1, even if f has no potentially good reductions. Consider the following example: Suppose that K is non-archimedean, and set $f(z) = z^d + c \in K[z]$. Then $f(\infty) = \infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$ and, moreover, $\mu_f = \nu_\infty$ on P^1 by (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii) (no matter whether f has no potentially good reductions). We can fix $c \in K$ so close to ∞ that $\mathsf{J}(f) \cap \mathbb{P}^1 \neq \emptyset$, so that f has no potentially good reductions (by Remark 3.9). We can also fix $z_0 \in D_\infty \cap K$ so close to ∞ that $\nu_{z_0, \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty} = \nu_\infty$ on P^1 (by Fact 2.7) and that $f(z_0) \neq z_0$. Set $m(z) := 1/(z - z_0) \in PGL(2, K)$ and $\phi(z) := (m \circ f \circ m^{-1})(z) \in K(z)$. Then ϕ still has no potentially good reductions (by Fact 3.2) and, by $z_0 \in D_\infty(f)$, $f(D_\infty(f)) = D_\infty(f)$, and $m(\mathsf{F}(f)) = \mathsf{F}(\phi)$ (see Fact 3.3), we have $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(\phi)$ and $\phi(D_\infty(\phi)) = D_\infty(\phi)$. Furthermore, by Fact 3.3 and **(c)** in Remark 2.6, we also have $\mu_\phi = m_*(\mu_f) = m_*(\nu_{z_0, \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty(f)}) = \nu_{\infty, \mathsf{P}^1 \setminus D_\infty(\phi)}$ on P^1. However $\phi(\infty) \neq \infty$ by $f(z_0) \neq z_0$.

4.3. **Proof of the final assertion.** If f has a potentially good reduction, then $\mu_f = \delta_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ on P^1 and $\mathsf{J}(f) = \{\mathcal{S}_0\}$ for some $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathsf{H}^1$ (see Remark 3.9), so that $\infty \in \mathsf{F}(f)$. Moreover, $\nu_\infty = \delta_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ on P^1 (by Example 2.8). $\Box$

Acknowledgement. The first author was partially supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C), 15K04924.

References

[1] Baker, M. A finiteness theorem for canonical heights attached to rational maps over function fields, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **626** (2009), 205–233.

[2] Baker, M. H. and Rumely, R. Equidistribution of small points, rational dynamics, and potential theory, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, **56**, 3 (2006), 625–688.

[3] Baker, M. and Rumely, R. *Potential theory and dynamics on the Berkovich projective line*, Vol. 159 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2010).

[4] Benedetto, R. Non-archimedean dynamics in dimension one: lecture notes, *Preprint. Available at http://math.arizona.edu/˜swc/aws/2010/* (2010).

[5] Benedetto, R. L. Non-Archimedean holomorphic maps and the Ahlfors Islands theorem, *Amer. J. Math.*, **125**, 3 (2003), 581–622.

[6] Berkovich, V. G. *Spectral theory and analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields*, Vol. 33 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1990).

[7] Berteloot, F. and Mayer, V. *Rudiments de dynamique holomorphe*, Vol. 7 of *Cours Spécialisés [Specialized Courses]*, Société Mathématique de France, Paris (2001).

[8] Brolin, H. Invariant sets under iteration of rational functions, *Ark. Mat.*, **6** (1965), 103–144.

[9] Chambert-Loir, A. Mesures et équidistribution sur les espaces de Berkovich, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **595** (2006), 215–235.

[10] DeMarco, L. Dynamics of rational maps: Lyapunov exponents, bifurcations, and capacity, *Math. Ann.*, **326**, 1 (2003), 43–73.

[11] Favre, C. and Jonsson, M. *The valuative tree*, Vol. 1853 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2004).

[12] Favre, C. and Rivera-Letelier, J. Équidistribution quantitative des points de petite hauteur sur la droite projective, *Math. Ann.*, **335**, 2 (2006), 311–361.

[13] Favre, C. and Rivera-Letelier, J. Théorie ergodique des fractions rationnelles sur un corps ultramétrique, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, **100**, 1 (2010), 116–154.

[14] Freire, A., Lopes, A. and Mañé, R. An invariant measure for rational maps, *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat.*, **14**, 1 (1983), 45–62.

[15] Jonsson, M. Dynamics on Berkovich spaces in low dimensions, Berkovich Spaces and Applications, Springer (2015), 205–366.

[16] Lalley, S. P. Brownian motion and the equilibrium measure on the Julia set of a rational mapping, *Ann. Probab.*, **20**, 4 (1992), 1932–1967.

[17] Ljubich, M. J. Entropy properties of rational endomorphisms of the Riemann sphere, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **3**, 3 (1983), 351–385.

[18] Lopes, A. O. Equilibrium measures for rational maps, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **6**, 3 (1986), 393–399.

[19] Mañé, R. and da Rocha, L. F. Julia sets are uniformly perfect, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **116**, 3 (1992), 251–257.

[20] Minda, C. D. Regular analytic arcs and curves, *Colloq. Math.*, **38**, 1 (1977), 73–82.

[21] Oba, M. K. and Pitcher, T. S. A new characterization of the F set of a rational function, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **166** (1972), 297–308.

[22] Okuyama, Y. Adelic equidistribution, characterization of equidistribution, and a general equidistribution theorem in non-archimedean dynamics, *Acta. Arith.*, **161**, 2 (2013), 101–125.

[23] Okuyama, Y. Algebraic divisors on the projective line having small diagonals and small heights and their application to adelic dynamics, *ArXiv e-prints, to appear in Pacific J. Math.* (July 2013).

[24] Okuyama, Y. Quantitative approximations of the Lyapunov exponent of a rational function over valued fields, *Math. Z.*, **280**, 3-4 (2015), 691–706.

[25] Okuyama, Y. and Stawiska, M. Potential theory and a characterization of polynomials in complex dynamics, *Conform. Geom. Dyn.*, **15** (2011), 152–159.

[26] Ransford, T. *Potential theory in the complex plane*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1995).

[27] Saff, E. B. and Totik, V. *Logarithmic potentials with external fields*, Vol. 316 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1997), Appendix B by Thomas Bloom.

[28] Silverman, J. H. *The arithmetic of dynamical systems*, Vol. 241 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer, New York (2007).

[29] Thuillier, A. *Théorie du potentiel sur les courbes en géométrie analytique non archimédienne. Applications à la théorie d'Arakelov*, PhD thesis, Université Rennes 1 (2005).

[30] Tsuji, M. *Potential theory in modern function theory*, Chelsea Publishing Co., New York (1975), Reprinting of the 1959 original.

Division of Mathematics, Kyoto Institute of Technology, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8585 Japan
E-mail address: `okuyama@kit.ac.jp`

Mathematical Reviews, 416 Fourth St., Ann Arbor, MI 48103, USA
E-mail address: `stawiska@umich.edu`